

# **LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 53647 AND VARIANCE 02-10**

## **Draft Environmental Impact Report**

*Prepared for*  
**City of La Cañada Flintridge  
1327 Foothill Boulevard  
La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137**

*Prepared by*  
**EIP Associates  
12301 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 430  
Los Angeles, CA 90025**

**April 28, 2003**



---

# **CONTENTS**

---

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
Introduction .....	ix
Project Description .....	ix
Areas of Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved .....	x
Classification of Environmental Impacts.....	x
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	x
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Purpose and Legal Authority.....	1-1
1.2 Scope of the EIR.....	1-1
1.3 Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies .....	1-2
1.4 Environmental Review Process.....	1-3
1.5 EIR Adequacy.....	1-5
1.6 Intended Use of the EIR .....	1-5
1.7 Incorporation by Reference.....	1-6
1.8 Document Organization .....	1-6
1.9 Cumulative Projects Scenario.....	1-7
<b>2.0 Project Description .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Project Applicant .....	2-1
2.2 Project Location .....	2-1
2.3 Project Site Characteristics.....	2-1
2.4 Surrounding Land Uses .....	2-4
2.5 Proposed Project Description.....	2-4
2.6 Construction Schedule.....	2-7
2.7 Project Objectives.....	2-7
2.8 Public Actions and Approvals .....	2-7
<b>3.0 Environmental Analysis.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Aesthetics.....	3.1-1
3.1.1 Environmental Setting.....	3.1-1
3.1.2 Regulatory Framework.....	3.1-15
3.1.3 Thresholds of Significance .....	3.1-21
3.1.4 Impacts.....	3.1-21
3.1.5 Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.1-24
3.1.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	3.1-24
3.1.7 References.....	3.1-25
3.2 Air Quality .....	3.2-1
3.2.1 Environmental Setting.....	3.2-1
3.2.2 Regulatory Framework.....	3.2-4
3.2.3 Thresholds of Significance .....	3.2-6
3.2.4 Impacts.....	3.2-6
3.2.5 Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.2-9
3.2.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	3.2-11

## Contents

---

	3.2.7	References .....	3.2-12
3.3	Biological Resources .....	3.3-1	
	3.3.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.3-1
	3.3.2	Regulatory Framework .....	3.3-18
	3.3.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.3-21
	3.3.4	Impacts.....	3.3-22
	3.3.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts.....	3.3-28
	3.3.6	Cumulative Impacts .....	3.3-33
	3.3.7	References .....	3.3-34
3.4	Cultural Resources.....	3.4-1	
	3.4.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.4-1
	3.4.2	Regulatory Framework .....	3.4-6
	3.4.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.4-8
	3.4.4	Impacts.....	3.4-8
	3.4.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts.....	3.4-9
	3.4.6	Cumulative Impacts .....	3.4-10
	3.4.7	References .....	3.4-10
3.5	Geology and Soils .....	3.5-1	
	3.5.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.5-2
	3.5.2	Regulatory Framework .....	3.5-4
	3.5.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.5-5
	3.5.4	Impacts.....	3.5-6
	3.5.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts.....	3.5-9
	3.5.6	Cumulative Impacts .....	3.5-11
	3.5.7	Glossary.....	3.5-12
	3.5.8	References .....	3.5-13
3.6	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	3.6-1	
	3.6.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.6-1
	3.6.2	Regulatory Framework .....	3.6-2
	3.6.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.6-4
	3.6.4	Impacts.....	3.6-4
	3.6.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts.....	3.6-6
	3.6.6	Cumulative Impacts .....	3.6-7
	3.6.7	References .....	3.6-7
3.7	Hydrology and Water Quality .....	3.7-1	
	3.7.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.7-1
	3.7.2	Regulatory Framework .....	3.7-3
	3.7.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.7-6
	3.7.4	Impacts.....	3.7-6
	3.7.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts.....	3.7-12
	3.7.6	Cumulative Impacts .....	3.7-14
	3.7.7	References .....	3.7-14
3.8	Land Use .....	3.8-1	
	3.8.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.8-1
	3.8.2	Regulatory Framework .....	3.8-2
	3.8.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.8-19
	3.8.4	Impacts.....	3.8-20
	3.8.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts.....	3.8-21
	3.8.6	Cumulative Impacts .....	3.8-22
	3.8.7	References .....	3.8-22

3.9	Noise.....	3.9-1
3.9.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.9-1
3.9.2	Regulatory Framework.....	3.9-4
3.9.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.9-4
3.9.4	Impacts.....	3.9-7
3.9.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.9-9
3.9.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	3.9-9
3.9.7	References.....	3.9-9
3.10	Public Services .....	3.10-1
3.10.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.10-1
3.10.2	Regulatory Framework.....	3.10-3
3.10.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.10-4
3.10.4	Impacts.....	3.10-5
3.10.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.10-7
3.10.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	3.10-7
3.10.7	References.....	3.10-8
3.11	Recreation .....	3.11-1
3.11.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.11-1
3.11.2	Regulatory Framework.....	3.11-6
3.11.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.11-6
3.11.4	Impacts.....	3.11-6
3.11.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.11-7
3.11.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	3.11-7
3.11.7	References.....	3.11-7
3.12	Traffic and Circulation .....	3.12-1
3.12.1	Project Description .....	3.12-1
3.12.2	Existing Conditions .....	3.12-3
3.12.3	Regulatory Context.....	3.12-8
3.12.4	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.12-8
3.12.5	Impacts.....	3.12-9
3.12.6	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.12-11
3.12.7	Cumulative Impacts.....	3.12-12
3.12.8	References.....	3.12-21
3.13	Population and Housing.....	3.13-1
3.13.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.13-1
3.13.2	Regulatory Framework.....	3.13-6
3.13.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.13-7
3.13.4	Impacts.....	3.13-7
3.13.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.13-8
3.13.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	3.13-8
3.13.7	References.....	3.13-8
3.14	Utilities and Service Systems.....	3.14-1
3.14.1	Environmental Setting.....	3.14-1
3.14.2	Regulatory Framework.....	3.14-4
3.14.3	Thresholds of Significance .....	3.14-7
3.14.4	Impacts.....	3.14-8
3.14.5	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts .....	3.14-13
3.14.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	3.14-14
3.14.7	References.....	3.14-15

## Contents

---

<b>4.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	4-1
4.2 Rationale for Selecting Potentially Feasible Alternatives .....	4-2
4.3 Factors Considered in the Development of Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	4-2
4.4 No Project/No Development Alternative.....	4-3
4.4.1 Description.....	4-3
4.4.2 Impacts.....	4-3
4.4.3 Attainment of Project Objectives .....	4-5
4.5 Alternative configuration .....	4-6
4.5.1 Description.....	4-6
4.5.2 Impacts.....	4-6
4.5.3 Attainment of Project Objectives .....	4-12
4.6 Reduced Project Alternative.....	4-13
<u>Option A</u> 4-13	
4.6.1 Description.....	4-13
4.6.2 Impacts.....	4-13
<u>Option B</u> 4-20	
4.6.3 Description.....	4-20
4.6.4 Impacts.....	4-20
4.6.5 Attainment of Project Objectives .....	4-24
4.7 Alternatives Found to Be Infeasible.....	4-24
4.8 Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	4-26
4.9 Comparison of Alternatives .....	4-26
<b>5.0 Other CEQA Considerations .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	5-1
5.2 Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impacts .....	5-2
5.3 Growth-Inducing Impacts .....	5-3
5.4 Effects Not Found to Be Significant .....	5-4
<b>6.0 Organizations and Persons Consulted/List of EIR Preparers .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1 Organizations and Persons Consulted.....	6-1
6.2 List of EIR Preparers .....	6-1
<b>7.0 References .....</b>	<b>7-1</b>

## Appendices

Appendix A	Initial Study / Notice of Preparation
Appendix B	Comment Letters on the Initial Study / Notice of Preparation
Appendix C	Air Quality Data
Appendix D	Biology Sensitive-Species Lists
Appendix E	Hydrology Report
Appendix F	Noise Data
Appendix G	Traffic Report

**Figures**

Figure 2-1	Regional Location .....	2-2
Figure 2-2	Project Location .....	2-3
Figure 2-3	Proposed Site Plan.....	2-5
Figure 3.1-1	Aerial View of Project Area Indicating Viewshed A, B, and C and Photo Locations.....	3.1-3
Figure 3.1-2	Photos 1 and 2 .....	3.1-5
Figure 3.1-3	Photos 3 and 4 .....	3.1-6
Figure 3.1-4	Photos 5 and 6 .....	3.1-7
Figure 3.1-5	Photos 7 and 8 .....	3.1-8
Figure 3.1-6	Photos 9 and 10 .....	3.1-9
Figure 3.1-7	Photos 11 and 12 .....	3.1-11
Figure 3.1-8	Photos 13 and 14 .....	3.1-12
Figure 3.1-9	Photos 15 and 16 .....	3.1-13
Figure 3.1-10	Photos 17 and 18 .....	3.1-14
Figure 3.3-1	Vegetation Communities.....	3.3-9
Figure 3.9-1	Noise Measurements .....	3.9-5
Figure 3.12-1	Study Area.....	3.12-2
Figure 3.12-2	Existing Conditions.....	3.12-5
Figure 3.12-3	Future No Project Conditions .....	3.12-13
Figure 3.12-4	Location of Cumulative Projects.....	3.12-15
Figure 3.12-5	Project Trip Distribution.....	3.12-18
Figure 3.12-6	Project-Only Traffic Volumes .....	3.12-19
Figure 3.12-7	Future With Project Conditions .....	3.12-20
Figure 4-1	Alternate Configuration Site Plan .....	4-7
Figure 4-2	Reduced Project Alternative Site Plan—Option A .....	4-15
Figure 4-3	Reduced Project Alternative Site Plan—Option B .....	4-21

**Tables**

Table ES-1	Summary of Significant Impacts.....	xi
Table 1-1	Cumulative Projects .....	1-9
Table 3.2-1	Summary of Ambient Air Quality in the Project Vicinity .....	3.2-3
Table 3.2-2	Existing Localized Carbon Monoxide Concentrations .....	3.2-4
Table 3.2-3	Project Daily Operational Emissions .....	3.2-7
Table 3.2-4	Future Cumulative Localized Carbon Monoxide Concentrations .....	3.2-7
Table 3.2-5	Estimated Daily Construction Emissions.....	3.2-9
Table 3.3-1	Wildlife Species Observed On the La Cañada Flintridge Site.....	3.3-3
Table 3.3-2	Native Plant Species Observed within the La Cañada Flintridge Project Site .....	3.3-6
Table 3.3-3	Nonnative Plant Species Observed within the La Cañada Flintridge Project Site.....	3.3-8
Table 3.3-4	Impacts by Category to On-Site Vegetation within the La Cañada Flintridge Project Site (Acres) .....	3.3-22
Table 3.4-1	Refined Coastal Chronology As Defined by Mason and Peterson (1994).....	3.4-3
Table 3.5-1	Estimated Maximum Parameters for Three Major Known Faults Affecting the Project Area.....	3.5-2
Table 3.7-1	Summary of Existing and Proposed Hydrology .....	3.7-7
Table 3.7-2	Summary of Existing and Proposed Storm Flows at Debris Basin (Point K in Figure # 2).....	3.7-8

---

**Contents**

Table 3.7-3	Summary of Existing and Proposed Debris Potential at Debris Basin (Point K in Figure # 2) .....	3.7-8
Table 3.8-1	City of La Cañada Flintridge Tentative Tract 53647 Lot Sizes and Building Footprints .....	3.8-20
Table 3.9-1	Typical Sound Levels Measured in the Environment .....	3.9-2
Table 3.9-2	Existing Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels .....	3.9-3
Table 3.9-3	Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels .....	3.9-7
Table 3.9-4	Future Off-Site Noise Levels .....	3.9-8
Table 3.9-5	Cumulative Project Noise Levels .....	3.9-9
Table 3.11-1	Fire Services in the City of La Cañada Flintridge .....	3.10-1
Table 3.11-2	School Breakdown serving the Project Site and Current Status .....	3.10-3
Table 3.11-3	Increased Students from Project Buildout .....	3.10-6
Table 3.12-1	Level of Service Interpretation .....	3.12-6
Table 3.12-2	Level of Service Definitions for Street Segments .....	3.12-7
Table 3.12-3	Intersection Level of Service .....	3.12-8
Table 3.12-4	Existing Condition Street Segment Peak Hour Level of Service .....	3.12-8
Table 3.12-5	Future With Project Intersection Level of Service .....	3.12-9
Table 3.12-6	Future With Project Condition Street Segment Peak Hour Level of Service .....	3.12-9
Table 3.12-7	Cumulative Project Trip Generation .....	3.12-14
Table 3.12-8	Future No Project Intersection Level of Service .....	3.12-14
Table 3.12-9	Future No Project Condition Street Segment Peak Hour Level of Service .....	3.12-16
Table 3.12-10	Project Trip Generation .....	3.12-16
Table 3.12-11	Street Segment Peak Hour Level of Service Comparison .....	3.12-21
Table 3.13-1	Population Growth .....	3.13-1
Table 3.13-2	Household Size .....	3.13-2
Table 3.13-3	Total Number of Housing Units (Defined by Units per Structure) .....	3.13-3
Table 3.13-4	Vacancy Rate for the City of La Cañada Flintridge .....	3.13-4
Table 3.13-5	Renter-Occupied Housing vs. Owner-Occupied Housing .....	3.13-4
Table 3.13-6	Median Home Values and Rents .....	3.13-5
Table 3.13-7	City of Pasadena RHNA Needs by Income Category .....	3.13-5
Table 3.13-8	SCAG Population, Housing, and Employment Forecast .....	3.13-6
Table 3.14-1	Typical Residential Water Usage .....	3.14-8
Table 3.14-2	Typical Outdoor Residential Water Usage .....	3.14-8
Table 3.14-3	Estimated Water Demand .....	3.14-9
Table 3.11-4	Estimated Average Wastewater Generation .....	3.14-12
Table 4-1	Comparison of Alternatives .....	4-27
Table 6-1	Organizations and Persons Consulted .....	6-1
Table 6-2	List of EIR Preparers .....	6-2

---

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed La Cañada Flintridge Tentative Tract Map 53647 and Variance 02-10 (also referred to as the proposed project), the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts associated with the proposed project.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) discusses the environmental impacts associated with implementation/approval of the proposed La Cañada Flintridge Tentative Tract Map 53647 and Variance 02-10 project. A complete description of the proposed project is provided in Section 2.0 of this EIR, and a summary of the proposed project is provided below. This EIR provides a discussion of impacts by issue area and provides mitigation measures, where appropriate. Specific issue areas discussed in this EIR include aesthetics, air quality, cultural and historic resources, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services, population and housing, utilities and service systems, and public services (police, and schools), traffic and circulation, and recreation, which are provided in Sections 3.1 through 3.14 of this document. Agricultural resources, economic and social impacts, and energy and mineral resources were determined to result in no environmental impacts or less-than-significant environmental impacts. These issue areas were fully evaluated in the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix A to this document. An analysis of alternatives to the proposed project and long-term implications resulting from project implementation are also provided. In addition, the public review and approval process for the EIR is outlined.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project is located in the southern section of the City of La Cañada Flintridge in a residential neighborhood in the eastern portion of the San Rafael Hills. The project site is lots 37 and 38 in block 5 of Tract 9575, and portions of lots 22, 23, 32, 33, and 35 in block 16 of Flintridge. The Applicant proposes to create 17 building pads to be sold later individually, and one 18.36-acre open space lot that will be placed under a conservation easement or similar preservation action. The project also includes the approval of Variance 02-10 by the Planning Commission, which will allow for smaller minimum lot sizes than the current Hillside Ordinance designates. Additional components of the proposed project include infrastructure improvements and additions, cut-and-fill-grading, as well as a sediment detention basin. Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to require approximately 60 months. This total includes approximately 12 months of infrastructure development and construction and grading for the proposed pads, which would begin in approximately, spring 2004, and continue through approximately spring 2005. Completion is estimated in 2008.

## **AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

The discussion of environmental effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives, as summarized in Table ES-1 and evaluated in detail in this EIR, constitutes the identification of issues to be resolved and areas of controversy, as required for compliance with Section 15123(b)(2) and 15123(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Additionally, comment letters received during the public review period for the IS/NOP indicated that potential issues to be resolved included the following: (1) stormwater discharge; (2) impacts on sensitive biological resources and disturbance of habitat; (3) fire protection; (4) traffic congestion and safety, (5) impacts to archeological and cultural resources, (6) impacts to viewsheds, (7) recreation impacts, (8) flooding hazards and mud flows, (9) utility provisos (10) impacts to sewers; and (11), impacts to schools These issues are addressed in Chapter 3.0 (Environmental Analysis). A copy of these comment letters is provided in Appendix B

## **CLASSIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Potential environmental impacts have been classified in the following categories:

- **Less Than Significant**—Results in no substantial adverse change to existing environmental conditions
- **Potentially Significant**—Constitutes a substantial adverse change to existing environmental conditions that can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by implementation of feasible mitigation measures or by the selection of an environmentally superior project alternative; or
- **Significant and Unavoidable**—Constitutes a substantial adverse change to existing environmental conditions that cannot be fully mitigated by implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, or by the selection of an environmentally superior project alternative.

## **SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Pursuant to Section 15123(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, Table ES-1 contains a summary of potentially significant or significant and unavoidable environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid those effects, and the level of significance of the impacts following the implementation of mitigation measures.

## Table ES-1 Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

	<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<b>ESTHETICS</b>			
	The project's impact to the existing visual character and its effect on surrounding uses are included in this analysis. Impacts associated with short-term construction-related visual impacts, architectural character, and visual impacts of grading are less than significant. Alteration to existing viewsheds is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.		
<b>Impact AES-1</b>	The proposed project would result in significant visual impacts associated with grading. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.	<b>MM AES-1.1</b> The Applicant shall submit the proposed project to the Department of Community Development for landscaping/tree protection review and approval, consistent with Chapter 4.26 (Tree Ordinance) of the La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code, prior to any construction and/or development. <b>MM AES-1.2.</b> The Applicant shall submit the proposed project to the Department of Community Development for hillside plan review and approval, consistent with Chapter 11.35 (Hillside Development) of the La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code, prior to any construction and/or development.	Significant and Unavoidable
<b>Impact AES-2</b>	The proposed project would result in significant alterations to existing viewsheds. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.	<b>MM AES-1.3</b> Grading shall be accomplished in accordance with Chapter 11.35.042 (Hillside Development Grading) of the La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code so as to complement the natural contours of the site, have finished grading appear natural, and minimize the alteration of the natural landform.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AES-1.1, AES-1.2, and AES-1.3 above.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>			
			Visual impacts associated with the proposed project, in combination with other alterations to visual resources throughout the region, would result in the degradation of community-wide visual resources. For the City and the surrounding region, the diminishing visual resources would result from increasing development intensity (and general reduction in the aesthetic value of natural resources) and the degradation of primary ridgelines. Although all development within the City would be subject to the Municipal Code and General Plan policies applicable to Aesthetics, large-scale loss of the aesthetic value associated with these resources that affects public views would be considered cumulatively significant.
			Since project development would modify lands that are undeveloped, the character of the area would be substantially altered, which would result in significant cumulative impacts. Approximately 18 acres of the project site would remain as dedicated open space, with additional landscaped areas surrounding each home site, retaining some of the site's natural landform features, and the project would not appear out of character when compared with surrounding land uses. However, the increase in development intensity of the project site, when compared with current uses, contributes incrementally to

## Table ES-1

### Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>  This section evaluates the potential impacts on air quality resulting from construction and operation of the proposed project. Less-than-significant impacts include daily operational emissions, local air quality, AQMP consistency, and the potential for release of toxic air contaminants. Potentially significant impacts include contribution of construction activities to an existing air quality violation.  <b>Impact AQ-1</b> Site preparation and construction activities would contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation.	<p><b>MM AQ-1.1</b> The project builder(s) shall develop and implement a construction management plan, as approved by the City of La Cañada Flintridge, which includes the following measures recommended by the SCAQMD, or equivalently effective measures approved by the City of La Cañada Flintridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference</li> <li>▪ Provide temporary traffic controls during all phases of construction activities to maintain traffic flow (e.g., flag person)</li> <li>▪ Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system to off-peak hours to the degree practicable</li> <li>▪ Consolidate truck deliveries when possible</li> <li>▪ Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust emissions</li> <li>▪ Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel to the extent available and at competitive prices</li> <li>▪ Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline to the extent available and at competitive prices</li> </ul> <p><b>MM AQ-1.2</b> The project builder(s) shall implement all rules and regulations by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD that are applicable to the development of the Project (such as Rule 402—Nuisance and Rule 403—Fugitive Dust) and that are in effect at the time of development. The following measures are currently recommended to implement Rule 403—Fugitive Dust. These measures have been quantified by the SCAQMD as being able to reduce dust generation between 30 and 85 percent depending on the source of the dust generation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water trucks will be utilized on the site and shall be available to</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	<p>be used throughout the day during site grading and excavation to keep the soil damp enough to prevent dust from being raised by the operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Wet down the areas that are to be graded or that are being graded and/or excavated, in the late morning and after work is completed for the day</li> <li>▪ All unpaved parking or staging areas, or unpaved road surfaces shall be watered three times daily or have chemical soil stabilizers applied according to manufacturers' specifications</li> <li>▪ Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply approved soil binders to exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, and dirt) according to manufacturers' specifications</li> <li>▪ The construction disturbance area shall be kept as small as possible</li> <li>▪ All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or have water applied to the exposed surface prior to leaving the site to prevent dust from impacting the surrounding areas</li> <li>▪ Wheel washers shall be installed where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads and used to wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip</li> <li>▪ Streets adjacent to the project site shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads</li> <li>▪ Wind barriers shall be installed along the perimeter of the site</li> <li>▪ All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour over a 30-minute period</li> <li>▪ A traffic speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be posted and enforced for the unpaved construction roads (if any) on the project site</li> <li>▪ Remediation operations, if required, shall be performed in stages concentrating in single areas at a time to minimize the impact of fugitive dust on the surrounding area.</li> </ul>	

**Cumulative Impacts**

The SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook identifies the following three methods that could be used to analyze the cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Only the method that is applicable (if any) to the proposed project should be analyzed:

- Reduce the rate of growth in vehicle miles traveled (VMT and trips)

**Table ES-1** **Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One percent reduction in project emissions           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1.5 average vehicle ridership (AVR), or average vehicle occupancy (AVO) if a transportation project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

However, staff at SCAQMD permits an alternative method of evaluation of the cumulative air quality impacts of a proposed project that is applicable to the proposed project. SCAQMD staff provides that a development project shall not be considered cumulatively considerable for air quality if the development project: (i) does not generate significant air quality impacts on its own, (ii) does not propose any greater number of unity or building space than what is allowed under the existing general plan for the site, (iii) is consistent with AQMP forecasts, and (iv) does not have other projects proposed in close proximity whereby the two projects act as one larger project that would generate emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds. As discussed in the EIR section, the daily emissions would be substantially below the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds of significance, the project is consistent with all adopted land use designations for the site, and the project is consistent with AQMP population forecasts. There are no other projects proposed in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the emissions generated by the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

This section discusses biological resources that occur on the proposed project site that could be affected by the project, evaluates potential project impacts on those resources, and provides mitigation measures to avoid or reduce those impacts. Less-than-significant impacts were identified to chaparral, mule fat scrub, annual grassland, areas of disturbed vegetation, non-sensitive wildlife, and special status bat species. Potentially significant impacts to loss of native and/or specimen trees, adverse effects on riparian habitat, and coastal sage scrub, potential for introduction of undesirable invasive non-native plant species to the project site and adjacent area, habitat modifications resulting in potential reduction in nesting opportunities for resident and migratory avian species of special concern and raptors known to breed in the project vicinity, potential for loss of San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, a Federal Species of Concern, potential loss of the coastal western whiptail, a special status species, and potential for direct or indirect effects on the hydrology and aquatic habitat quality of the unnamed intermittent drainage located in the central portion of the project site and its tributaries.

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>Impact BIO-1</b> Implementation of the proposed project would violate La Cañada Flintridge's Tree Ordinance through the loss of listed native trees. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	<p><b>MM BIO-1.1</b> The Applicant, prior to being issued a grading permit, shall prepare a tree report that meets the requirements of the La Cañada Flintridge's Tree Ordinance. It shall also include the preparation and submission of a tree protection plan. When construction activities occur near protected tree species, Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid damage to the trees shall be implemented, and verified by the developer. The BMPs would include, but are not limited to, (1) installing protective fencing prior to and during construction, per Section 4.26.040 of the City's Tree Protection Guide; (2) avoiding disturbance and trenching within the tree drip line, (3) maintaining the surface grade around the tree, (4) prohibiting the placement of paving or landscaping requiring summer irrigation in the vicinity of trees, and (5) other recommendations found within tree report.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-1.2</b> A drainage plan shall be designed in such a way as to avoid changes to hydrology in the vicinity of the protected trees.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-1.3</b> Construction staging areas should be designated on the construction plans and parking, loading, and grading during all construction activities prohibited within the root zone of the protected trees.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-1.4</b> The Applicant shall provide a protected tree information manual to purchasers or homeowner's association.</p>	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact BIO-2</b> The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on coastal sage scrub communities, and riparian habitat, including riparian woodland and coast live oak woodlands, which are identified as sensitive natural communities by the CDFG. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	<p><b>MM BIO-2.1</b> The Applicant must notify the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and obtain a California Department of Fish and Game 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Section 404 Permit prior to final approval of grading and site construction plans. While the final conditions of the permits will be determined through coordination with these agencies, at a minimum the following actions shall be performed:</p> <p>(A) Impacted riparian vegetation that cannot be avoided, including that which is impacted due to brush clearing requirements, shall be replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio under a mitigation plan approved by the Corps and CDFG.</p>	Less Than Significant

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<p>Riparian trees shall be replaced at a ratio stipulated by CDFG, but not less than 2:1. If replacement within the area is not feasible, then an approved mitigation bank shall be used.</p> <p>(B) Revegetation shall be performed by a qualified revegetation specialist and shall be conducted only on sites where soils, hydrology, and microclimate conditions are suitable for riparian habitat. First priority shall be given to areas that are adjacent to existing patches of native habitat.</p> <p>(C) A riparian revegetation plan shall be prepared by a qualified revegetation specialist to include all measures for the reparation and maintenance of on and/or offsite riparian habitat. The plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The details and procedures required to prepare the restoration site for planting (i.e., grading, soil preparations, soil stocking, etc.), including the need for a supplemental irrigation system, if any.</li> <li>(2) The methods and procedures for the installation of the plant materials. Plant protection measures identified by this document, the project biologist, and/or agency personnel shall be incorporated into the planting design and layout.</li> <li>(3) Guidelines for the maintenance of the mitigation site during the establishment phase of the plantings. The maintenance program shall contain guidelines for the control of nonnative plant species, the maintenance of the irrigation system, and the replacement of plant species.</li> <li>(4) The revegetation plan shall provide for monitoring to evaluate the growth of the developing habitat and/or vegetation. Specific goals for the restored habitat shall be defined by quantitative and qualitative characteristics of similar habitats and plants (e.g., density, cover, species composition, structural development). The monitoring effort shall include an evaluation of not only the plant material installed, but the use of it by wildlife.</li> </ul>		

**Table ES-1** **Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<i>Impact Description</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Residual Impact</i>
<p>(5) Contingency plans and appropriate remedial measures shall also be outlined in the revegetation plan should the plantings fail to meet designated success criteria and planting goals.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-2.2</b> The Applicant shall avoid and preserve riparian vegetation to the extent feasible. Native streamside vegetation occurring in the riparian zone shall be protected and retained to filter groundwater runoff. In addition, a buffer zone extending 50 feet from the outer extent of any riparian forest on each side of the drainage shall be established and, if necessary, enhanced by plantings of native species within the project site adjacent to the intermittent drainage. Project design would site any drainage crossings for the proposed new streets in areas where riparian trees and other riparian vegetation are least dense.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-2.3</b> A conservation easement or other development restriction shall be placed over the entire 18.36 acres of Lot 18. The conservation easement or restriction shall stipulate permitted uses within this area, as well as provide a maintenance and enhancement plan, which would list, among other maintenance and enhancement, details, responsible parties, and a schedule for upkeep and maintenance. Alternatively, the parcel may be donated to a conservancy.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-2.4</b> Impacted coastal sage scrub vegetation that cannot be avoided, including that which is impacted due to brush-clearing requirements, shall be replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio under a mitigation plan approved by the CDFG. If replacement within the area is not feasible, then an approved mitigation bank shall be used. For either on-site or off-site revegetation, a mitigation monitoring plan shall be prepared and approved by the CDFG prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The mitigation plan shall contain a restoration plan as outlined below.</p> <p>A coastal sage scrub Restoration Plan shall be developed for</p>	<p>Monitoring reports of the mitigation site shall be reviewed by the permitting State and federal agency(s).</p>	

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<p>the establishment of coastal sage scrub on the project site or at a suitable offsite location. The location of the restoration areas shall be contiguous with other open space areas, either on-site or off-site, and shall be dedicated in perpetuity as undisturbed open space areas. The restoration program shall contain the following items:</p> <p>(A) Responsibilities and qualifications of the personnel to implement and supervise the plan. The responsibilities of the landowner, specialists, and maintenance personnel that will supervise and implement the plan will be specified.</p> <p>(B) Site selection. The site(s) for mitigation will be determined in coordination with the client and resource agencies.</p> <p>(C) Site preparation and planting implementation. The site preparation will include (1) protection of existing native species; (2) trash and weed removal; (3) native species salvage and reuse (i.e., duff); (4) soil treatments (i.e., imprinting, decompressing); (5) temporary irrigation installation; (6) erosion control measures (i.e., rice or willow wattles); (7) seed mix application; and (8) container species planting.</p> <p>(D) Schedule. A schedule will be developed which includes planting to occur in late fall and early winter, between October and January 30.</p> <p>(E) Maintenance plan/guidelines. The maintenance plan will include (1) weed control; (2) herbivory control; (3) trash removal; (4) irrigation system maintenance; (5) maintenance training; and (6) replacement planting.</p> <p>(F) Monitoring Plan. The monitoring plan will include (1) qualitative monitoring (i.e., photographs and general observations); (2) quantitative monitoring (i.e., randomly placed transects); (3) performance criteria as approved by the resource agencies; (4) monthly reports for the first year, and bimonthly thereafter; (5) annual reports for three to five years, which will be submitted to the resource agencies. The monitoring will be conducted for three to five years, depending upon the performance of the site or</p>		

**Table ES-1** Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>Impact BIO-3</b> Grading activities during project construction and the establishment of project landscaping could result in the introduction of undesirable invasive non-native plant species to the project site and adjacent areas.	requirements set by CDFG.  (G) Long-term preservation. Long-term preservation of the site will also be outlined in the conceptual mitigation plan to ensure the mitigation site is not impacted by future development.	Less Than Significant
<b>MM BIO-3</b> The potential establishment and expansion of exotic plant species into newly-graded areas should be minimized by seeding disturbed areas with a native grassland mix applied in conjunction with mulch and tackifier as soon as grading activities are completed. Landscaping on the site should contain as much native California species of trees, shrubs, and groundcovers appropriate to Los Angeles County and the project vicinity as possible. This would provide foraging opportunities for native wildlife. Appropriate native species include trees such as coast live oaks; shrubs such as blue elderberry, coffeeberry, and coyote brush; and native grasses, such as purple and foothill needlegrass.		
<b>Impact BIO-4</b> Implementation of the project could, through habitat modifications, result in a potential reduction in nesting opportunities for resident and migratory avian species of special concern and raptors known to breed in the project vicinity.	<b>MM BIO-4.1</b> If the construction phase occurs during the avian breeding season, generally February through August 1 then, prior to the onset of construction activities, surveys for nesting special status and/or migratory avian species and raptors will be conducted on the affected portion of the site following USFWS and/or CDFG guidelines. If no active avian nests are identified on or within 500 feet of the construction site, no further mitigation is necessary.  <b>MM BIO-4.2</b> If active nests for avian species of concern, migratory species, or raptors are found within the construction footprint or a 500-foot buffer zone, construction shall be delayed within the construction footprint and buffer zone until the young have fledged, or appropriate mitigation measures responding to the specific situation are developed in consultation with CDFG.	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact BIO-5</b> Implementation of the project may result in the loss or take of the coastal western whiptail, which is a special status species.	<b>MM BIO-5</b> Thirty days prior to construction activities in areas of the upland impact zone, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey to capture and relocate individual coastal western whiptails in order to avoid or minimize take of these	Less Than Significant

## Executive Summary

**Table ES-1** **Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<p>sensitive species. Individuals shall be relocated to nearby undisturbed areas with suitable habitat. Reconstruction surveys shall only be conducted in areas dominated by coastal sage scrub or if construction will occur within 300 feet of native upland habitat. Results of the surveys and relocation efforts shall be provided to CDFG and/or Los Angeles County Biologists in a Mitigation Status Report. Collection and relocation of animals shall only occur with the proper scientific collection and handling permits.</p>		Less Than Significant
<p><b>Impact BIO-6</b> Implementation of the project may result in the loss or take of the San Diego desert Woodrat, which is a special status species. This is considered a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p><b>MM BIO-6</b> Immediately prior to construction or grading activities, or as these activities are commencing, a survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if individuals of San Diego Woodrat (including unknown woodrat houses) occur within the construction and/or grading zone. If located, individuals of this species shall be captured and translocated unharmed into areas of appropriate habitat (either on or off site) that are not subject to further disturbance.</p> <p>Alternately, if the Applicant so desires, prior to construction, focused woodrat surveys performed by a qualified biologist, may be performed to determine if the woodrat house observed onsite is that of a San Diego woodrat. If this option is chosen, and no San Diego woodrat are found onsite, then no further action is required. However if San Diego woodrats are found within the construction or grading zone, then relocation, as described in paragraph one of this mitigation measure, shall be implemented.</p>	

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>Impact BIO-7</b> Implementation of the project could, through habitat modifications, result in a potential take of special status plant species. This is considered a potentially significant impact	<p><b>MM BIO-7</b> Due to potentially suitable habitat present on the property for several special status species, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist or botanist to conduct a preconstruction survey of the area within the footprint area of impact and extended 50 feet outside of the impact areas. The survey shall be conducted according to CNPS and CDFG protocols, during the blooming period or immediately prior to the onset of project-related disturbances. The purpose of the preconstruction survey shall be to locate any special-status plant species that may be present within or directly adjacent to the areas of impact. These surveys shall be restricted to habitat types that could support special-status plant species that have the potential to occur in the project area including the following listed plant species: Nevin's barberry, Braunton's milk-vetch, and slender-horned spineflower, as well as the following sensitive species: Parry's spineflower, Robinson's pepper-grass, Davidson's bush mallow, Brand's phacelia, and Plummer's mariposa lily.</p> <p>A report shall be submitted to the CDFG following the completion of the pre-construction survey that includes, at a minimum, a description of methodology including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel with resumes, a list of references cited and persons contacted, and a map showing the location(s) of any special status plants observed within or adjacent to the project site.</p>	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact BIO-8</b> Construction and operation of the proposed project could have direct and indirect effects upon the hydrology and aquatic habitat quality of the un-named intermittent drainage located in the central portion of the project site and its tributaries. These effects would constitute a potentially significant impact.	<p><b>MM BIO-8.1</b> The Applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall require that stormwater runoff be prevented from flowing over unprotected slopes and that silt fencing shall be trenched in 100 feet from the outer limits of riparian vegetation and left in place during construction. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized as quickly as possible, using biotechnical techniques.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-8.2</b> Construction and operation of the proposed project shall avoid contamination of the intermittent drainage by incorporating the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) California Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs)</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact	
<p>(b) Native plant species with minimum water and fertilizer requirements shall be selected and for landscaping to the extent feasible. Use of nitrogen fertilizers in landscaped areas shall be kept to a minimum. Watering shall be kept to the minimum necessary to maintain new landscaping. Drip irrigation shall be used only until native landscaping is established.</p> <p>(c) Compliance with Mitigation Measure HYD-3 and the inclusion of an analysis of sediment impacts on the intermittent channel</p>	<p>Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce all potentially significant impacts to biological resources to less-than-significant levels.</p>	<b>MM BIO-9</b> All lighting along the perimeter of natural and easement areas shall be downcast luminaries with light patterns directed away from natural areas, as coordinated with a certified lighting engineer and project biologist. Additionally, trails shall be unlit through any natural or easement areas.	Less Than Significant
<p><b>Impact BIO-9</b> Increases in nighttime illumination could disturb nighttime activities of local wildlife species, and alter local species composition; this is a potentially significant impact.</p> <p><b>Impact BIO-10</b> The project would be incompatible with Policy 4.1 of the City's Environmental Resource Management Element, Policy 3.1 of the City's Land Use Element, and Policies B and H of the City's Hillsides Ordinance. Per CEQA Section G thresholds, these conflicts with any local policies protecting biological resources would constitute a potentially significant impact.</p>	None Available	<b>Cumulative Impacts</b> The primary effects of the proposed project, when considered with other projects in the region, would be the cumulative direct loss of vegetation associations and wildlife habitat. Specifically, past, present, and probable future projects in the vicinity of the proposed project are anticipated to permanently remove plant and wildlife resources within development areas. In addition, wildlife populations within the surrounding undeveloped areas	Significant and Unavoidable

## Table ES-I Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<p>patches or larger areas of habitat that are fragmented would be subject to increased risks of local extirpation. The cumulative effect of the loss of plant and wildlife habitat in the region is expected to be an adverse, though not significant impact, because the San Rafael, Verdugo, and San Gabriel Mountains, including the Angeles National Forest and Los Padres National Forest, are expected to provide adequate protection of habitat for common plant and wildlife species in the region. Development in the vicinity of the project site, and the implementation of the Arroyo Seco Master Plan would increase the potential for impacts on tributaries to the Arroyo Seco, as well as the Arroyo Seco itself. These additional cumulative projects could result in changes to water quality from urban runoff, potentially containing petroleum residues, and runoff of nutrients from residential or landscaped areas. These cumulative effects, if uncontrolled, will ultimately begin to affect the Arroyo Seco. The Arroyo Seco is known to support diverse riparian communities and several special status species, including the Federally Endangered arroyo toad. These cumulative impacts are considered significant because they have the potential to substantially reduce the biological value of the Arroyo Seco if urban pollutants are excessive. However, implementation of SWPPP and use of California Stormwater Best Management Practices during and after construction would help reduce these cumulative impacts.</p>		
<p><b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b></p> <p>This section analyzes the cultural resources that occur on the proposed project site that could be affected by the project, evaluates potential project impacts on these resources, and provides mitigation measures to avoid or reduce those impacts. The Initial Study prepared for the project determined that no historic structures are located on the project site, and that no known Native American cultural values are associated with the project site. This section addresses archeological and paleontological resources and human burials. Less-than-significant impacts were identified to paleontological resources. The proposed project could result in potential damage to or destruction of previously unknown archeological resources, or disturbance of human burials or remains associated with archaeological contexts.</p>	<p><b>MM CR-I.1</b> The applicant shall retain a qualified professional archaeological monitor to be present during grading, trenching, and other excavation on the project site.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p><b>Impact CR-I</b> Construction of the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.</p>	<p><b>MM CR-I.2</b> If an archaeological site or feature is uncovered during site preparation activities, all construction activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease until the archaeological monitor has assessed the significance of the find and implemented appropriate measures for the collection or protection of the find.</p> <p>The archaeologist shall first determine whether an archaeological resource uncovered during construction is a "unique archaeological resource" under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g). If the archaeological resource is determined to be a "unique archaeological resource," the archaeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the City that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2 of the Public Resource Code. If the archaeologist determines that the archaeological resource is not a unique archaeological resource, the archaeologist may record the site and submit the</p>	

**Table ES-I**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure
<b>Impact CR-1</b> Construction of the proposed project could result in the disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.	recordation form to the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center. The archaeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center. Copies of the report with site-specific information expunged shall also be provided to the La Cañada Flintridge Historical Society.
<b>Impact CR-2</b> Construction of the proposed project could result in the disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.	<b>MM CR-2</b> In the event of the discovery of a burial, human bone, or suspected human bone, all excavation or grading in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately, the area of the find shall be protected, and the applicant immediately shall notify the City and the Los Angeles County Coroner of the find and comply with the provisions of P.R.C. Section 5097 with respect to Native American involvement, burial treatment, and re-burial, if necessary.

**Cumulative Impacts**

As described above in Impact CR-1, the proposed project site does not contain any known archaeological or paleontological resources. Development of the proposed project is not anticipated to affect any paleontological resources because the rock units beneath the project site do not preserve animal remains or form fossils; consequently, the project is not anticipated to contribute to any cumulative effect on paleontological resources, and this impact would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not, as described above, affect any known archaeological resources, and the implementation of the proposed project would include Mitigation Measures CR-1.1 and CR-1.2, which would ensure identification and appropriate treatment of any previously unknown resources if any are uncovered during grading or excavation. The proposed project would not, therefore, have a significant effect on archaeological resources in the City of La Cañada Flintridge and is not anticipated, in combination with related development projects, to contribute to a cumulative effect upon such resources in the City. The cumulative impact of the proposed project upon archaeological resources would be less than significant.

## Table ES-I Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>		
The City of La Cañada Flintridge's Initial Study determined that the Tentative Tract Map 53647 and Variance 02-10 project had the potential to cause potentially significant impacts in matters of seismically induced slope instability, erosion, expansive soils, grading, and soil suitability for septic systems. Analysis in this section identifies opportunities to reduce, eliminate, or avoid those potentially significant impacts. This section of the EIR discusses the regional geologic and seismic characteristics influencing the project area; the local soils, slope, and erosion conditions at the project site; the potential effects of seismicity on the project; and the potential effects of the project on human safety. Fault rupture, volcanism, tsunami/seiche, and mineral resource issues were focused-out in the Initial Study as not having effects on, or being affected by, the proposed project. Sedimentation issues are addressed Section 3.07 (Hydrology and Water Quality).	<p><b>MM GEO-I</b> Site-specific soil suitability analysis and Less Than Significant</p> <p>The use of expansive, weak, or slide-prone soils for foundation, man-made slope, or roadway support without prior treatment could create unstable soil conditions at the construction site, thus threatening the integrity of completed construction. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p> <p><b>Impact GEO-I</b> The use of expansive, weak, or slide-prone soils for foundation, man-made slope, or roadway support without prior treatment could create unstable soil conditions at the construction site, thus threatening the integrity of completed construction. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p> <p><b>MM GEO-I</b> Site-specific soil suitability analysis and Less Than Significant</p> <p>Building Code Chapters 16, 18, 33, and A33) shall be required, as recommended by a California-registered soil engineer, during the design phase for each site where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected. During the design phase, where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected, the Developer's registered soil engineering consultant shall provide documentation to the City that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site-specific soil suitability and stability analyses has been conducted in the area of the proposed foundations and road bases to establish the design criteria for appropriate foundation or road base type and support</li> <li>▪ The recommended criteria have been incorporated in the design of foundation</li> <li>▪ During grading for these sites, the registered soils professional shall be on the site to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Observe areas of potential soil unsuitability or instability</li> <li>&gt; Supervise the implementation of soil remediation or reconstruction programs</li> <li>&gt; Verify final soil conditions prior to setting the foundations or constructing the roadway</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The registered soils engineering consultant shall prepare an "as built" map/report, to be filed with the City, showing details of the site soils, the location of foundations, retaining walls, sub-drains, clean-outs, etc., and the results of suitability/stability</p>	

**Table ES-1** **Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<b>Impact GEO-2</b> Construction activities on the project site could result in the increased potential for short- or long-term increases in erosion. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.	<p><b>MM GEO-2</b> The Applicant shall take the following actions to reduce the potential for erosion during and after the construction period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To the extent practicable, project site grading shall be scheduled for the dry season (April through September).</li> <li>▪ All NPDES permit requirements shall be fulfilled prior to issuance of building permits.</li> <li>▪ The Applicant shall submit a soil erosion and sedimentation control plan for the project to the City of La Cañada Flintridge prior to grading, subject to the following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; The Erosion and Sediment Transport Control Plan (as part of the overall SWPPP) shall be submitted, reviewed, approved, implemented, and inspected as part of the approval process for the grading plans.</li> <li>&gt; The Plan shall be designed by the master developers' erosion control consultant, using concepts similar to those formulated by the State of California, as appropriate, based on the specific erosion and sediment transport control needs of the site where grading, excavation, and construction is to occur. Those concepts include some that apply generally to the entire project area and some that would be appropriate only for specific sites. The possible methods are not necessarily limited to the following items:</li> <li>&gt; A biotechnical slope protection program shall be implemented using indigenous and other natural materials to create stable hillside configurations in the areas disturbed during the construction of building pads and access roads. The program shall match appropriate protection procedures to the slope being stabilized, using more intensive treatment on steep, vulnerable slopes, and less intensive treatment on gentle slopes, to prevent future damage that could result from the construction or operation of the residences. Staked straw wattles and straw bales, salvaged and replanted seeds, saplings or cuttings of local plants, replanted local grasses and nursery grown plants, brush boxes, willow bundles, silt fences, mulch made of chipped local woody plants, and temporary irrigation shall be used as appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Less Than Significant

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	<p>to create and maintain stable slope configurations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Revegetation of disturbed areas shall begin as soon as possible following the closure of excavation on each building pad site, consistent with completion of project construction. The stockpiled topsoil shall be spread in the disturbed areas, but not compacted beyond 60 percent recompaction, to allow the naturally occurring seeds and roots of local plants an opportunity for reestablishment. If necessary, the site shall be irrigated to encourage plant growth until the vegetation has been reestablished (probably by the time the winter rainy season begins). The sites shall be monitored for several weeks after project completion to ensure the vegetation is taking hold. If the vegetation is not reestablishing itself, cuttings or rootings shall be taken from local plants and established on the site.</li> <li>&gt; Stockpile the excavated topsoil separately from other subsurface materials to facilitate revegetation of disturbed areas at the close of grading. Sprinkled the stockpile as necessary to keep the surface moist, thus reducing wind erosion. Approximately <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> gallon of water per square yard, sprinkled twice a day over drying stockpiles and disrupted surfaces will settle fine dust raised during earth-moving procedures.</li> <li>&gt; Confine grading and activities related to grading (excavation, construction, preparation and use of equipment and material storage areas and staging areas, preparation of access roads) to the dry season, whenever possible.</li> <li>&gt; Locate staging areas outside streams and drainage ways.</li> <li>&gt; Keep the lengths and gradients of constructed slopes (cut or fill) as low as possible.</li> <li>&gt; Discharge grading and construction runoff into small drainages at frequent intervals to avoid buildup of large potentially erosive flows.</li> <li>&gt; Prevent runoff from flowing over unprotected slopes.</li> <li>&gt; Keep disturbed areas (areas of grading and related activities) to the minimum necessary for demolition or construction of the project.</li> <li>&gt; Keep runoff away from disturbed areas during grading and related activities.</li> </ul>	

## Executive Summary

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>&gt; Stabilize disturbed areas as quickly as possible, either by vegetative or mechanical methods.</li><li>&gt; Direct runoff over vegetated areas prior to discharge into public storm drainage systems, whenever possible.</li><li>&gt; Trap sediment before it leaves the site with such techniques as check dams, sediment ponds, or siltation fences.</li><li>&gt; Use interceptor ditches, drainage swales, or detention basins to prevent storm runoff from transporting sediment into drainage ways and to prevent sediment-laden runoff from leaving any disturbed areas.</li><li>&gt; Install sediment barriers (silt fences, straw rolls, etc.) to prevent sedimentation in areas adjacent to grading and down gradients into drainage ways. Design barriers using the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation to calculate their proper storage capacity. The contractor shall implement installation by prior to mass grading and other soil disturbing construction activities on site.</li><li>&gt; The contractor shall be responsible for the removal and disposal of all project-related sedimentation in off-site retention ponds.</li><li>&gt; Use landscaping and grading methods that lower the potential for down-stream sedimentation. Modified drainage patterns, longer flow paths, encouraging infiltration into the ground, and slower stormwater conveyance velocities are examples of effective methods.</li><li>&gt; Control landscaping activities carefully with regard to the application of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, or other hazardous substances. Provide proper instruction to all landscaping personnel on the construction team.</li><li>&gt; During the installation of the erosion and sediment transport control structures, the erosion control professional shall be on the site to supervise the implementation of the designs, and the maintenance of the facilities throughout the demolition, grading, and construction period</li></ul>	None Available, but <b>MM GEO-3</b> would lessen impacts

**Impact GEO-3** The Vista-Amargosa soil association on most of the hillsides has severe limitations for the use of private sewage disposal systems. Currently the feasibility of septic systems within lots 9-13 of the site has not been sufficiently demonstrated. This would be

Significant and  
Unavoidable

**MM GEO-3** Prior to final map approval, the Applicant must obtain all necessary permits to allow septic systems to be installed on lots 9 - 13. This would require the Applicant to

## Table ES-I Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact	
considered a potentially significant impact.	demonstrate the feasibility of the septic systems to the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services, and other pertinent regulatory agencies by having a qualified and certified professional perform percolation tests and prepare soil profile reports for the areas to be served by the septic systems.		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>			
<p>Cumulatively, the City of La Cañada Flintridge is subject to varying degrees of hazard from local geologic conditions, such as landslides, erosion, and seismic groundshaking. The most recognizable regional impact is earthquake damage caused by large earthquakes on the major active fault systems in the area. The City of La Cañada Flintridge Building Code is intended to reduce the risk of structural collapse and loss of life in new and retrofitted buildings in the City, but major damage and harm to humans could occur on a broader regional basis because cumulative development may attract residents and businesses to less seismically stable areas. Because new projects constructed on a cumulative basis throughout the region would be built to current, safer seismic standards than were existing older structures, fewer people would be expected to be injured or killed if they were in newer structures, and less property damage would be expected as a result of cumulative development. Project development would not compound risks to existing structures from landslides, erosion, and seismic groundshaking since these impacts are site specific. Additionally, the structures built on the proposed project would be constructed to comply with current building and safety codes that are designed to minimize the risk of death or injury to both the occupants of the dwellings proper, and individuals occupying adjacent structures. As such, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.</p>			
<b>HAZARDS</b>			
<p>This section provides a discussion of the potential adverse hazard-related impacts that could result from project construction and operation. For the purposes of this analysis, and due to the project site's undeveloped nature, the discussion of hazards focuses mainly on wildland fires. Specifically, the proposed project's potential to cause wildland fires and the increased risk of fire exposure to residents surrounding the site and on-site is evaluated with respect to both construction and operation.</p>	<b>Impact HAZ-1</b> Implementation of the proposed project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	<b>MM HAZ-1.1</b> The proposed development will require proper ingress/egress access for the circulation of traffic and emergency response issues, which shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review and approval prior to implementation.	Less than Significant <b>MM HAZ-1.2</b> Every building constructed shall be accessible to Fire Department apparatus by way of access roadways with an all weather surface of not less than the prescribed width, unobstructed, clear to sky. <b>MM HAZ-1.3</b> The roadway shall be extended to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls when measured by an unobstructed route around the exterior of the building. <b>MM HAZ-1.4</b> The Applicant shall ensure that required fire hydrants are located within 450 feet of each individual home, as

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	well as within 600 feet of each other as required by the City.	
<b>MM HAZ-1.5</b> The Applicant shall prepare a Fire Protection Plan (FPP) and a Hazardous Materials Management Plan for the construction phase of the project. Contingency analysis and planning shall be conducted to identify fire situations, how to minimize their occurrence, and how to respond should they actually occur. The City's Fire Department shall review and approve the plans based on their specific needs and resources.		
<b>MM HAZ-1.6</b> The Applicant shall notify emergency response providers near the proposed route in advance of construction activity the details of location, road closure schedules, and potential alternate routes. Schedules for necessary on-street parking closures would be published well in advance of the closures. Businesses and residents directly affected by the construction activity would be given ample notice and information to plan alternatives. Signage would be provided to direct motorists to alternative routes.		
<b>MM HAZ-1.7</b> The Applicant shall ensure strict code enforcement to reduce urban fires caused by violations of code sections related to fire safety.		
<b>MM HAZ-1.8</b> The Applicant shall provide weed and brush removal and planting of fire retardant materials with project implementation.		
<b>MM HAZ-1.9</b> Due to the project property location being within an area designated by the LACFD as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, a Final Fuel Modification Plan shall be submitted by the Applicant, which shall correlate to the LACFD guidelines and shall be approved prior to building permit approval by the City and the LACFD. Implementation of the approved Final Fuel Modification Plan and final inspection will be required prior to approval of occupancy of residences.		
<b>MM HAZ-1.10</b> The Applicant shall be responsible for the installation of interior automated fire-sprinkler systems (13-D system) in each residential unit, in accordance with the City Code.		

**Table ES-1** Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
The eventual development and occupation of the proposed project as well as future projects within the surrounding area will increase the density of residences within a high fire risk area and will cumulatively increase the risk of damage to property and/or life as a result of development in a wildland fire hazard area. This is considered to be a potentially significant impact. However, projects would have to conform to the County of Los Angeles Fire Department—Fuel Modification Plan Guidelines, which introduce mitigation measures specifically to reduce project related impacts from the risk of fire. These measures would reduce any potentially significant cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.		Less Than Significant
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>		
The purpose of this section is to describe the drainage impacts of the proposed project. Less-than-significant impacts were identified as to regional flooding impacts/erosion or siltation and impacts to groundwater. Potentially significant impacts were identified with regard to downstream flooding, debris blockage from surrounding hillsides, and short-term and long-term adverse water quality impacts.	<b>MM HYD-1</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a precise grading plan, detention basin/cistern plan, pervious pavement designs, and final hydrologic/hydraulic analysis shall be submitted to the City of La Cañada Flintridge for review and approval. Detailed design of the project storm drain system shall be consistent with the recommendations of the final hydrologic/hydraulic analysis, shall conform to the requirements of the City of La Cañada Flintridge, and shall ensure that the postconstruction runoff volume from the project site does not exceed the existing runoff volume.	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact HYD-1</b> Stormwater runoff from the proposed project could result in downstream flooding during storm events. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	<b>MM HYD-2</b> Site plans for the project shall implement the following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct a new debris basin upstream of the intersection of Bramley Way and Monarch Drive to intercept mudflows approaching from Bramley Way and the hilly terrain west of the recently constructed residence near the terminus of Bramley Way</li> <li>▪ Provide a slough wall along the uphill side of Monarch Drive to help reduce mudflows that will be conveyed to Inverness Drive from the proposed storm drain system south of Lot I</li> <li>▪ Add drought-resistant vegetation with geosynthetic matting-fiber-mulch matrix to stabilize the slopes and reduce erosion along the uphill side of Monarch Drive</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact HYD-2</b> Debris from the surrounding hillsides may block on-site roadways and disable localized storm drains. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	See MM HYD-1 and MM HYD-2, above.	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact HYD-3</b> The proposed project has the potential to increase runoff from the project site and could expose people or structures	See MM HYD-1 and MM HYD-2, above.	Less Than Significant

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<p><b>Impact HYD-4</b> Grading and construction activities on the project site have the potential to adversely affect surface water quality. These activities may increase erosion and contribute sediment to surface waters. Additionally, improper handling of construction materials and/or equipment may result in accidental spills that could adversely affect water quality.</p> <p>downstream of the site to increased risk of flooding.</p>	<p><b>MM HYD-4.1</b> Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project applicants shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State of California and comply with the requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit. This will include the preparation of a SWPPP incorporating BMPs for construction related control of the site runoff. This will require construction sediment and erosion control plans in connection with site grading activities. A State of California-licensed civil engineer shall prepare a SWPPP, and the plan should be reviewed and approved by the City of La Cañada Flintridge. The SWPPP should also include the following applicable measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Diversion of off-site runoff away from the construction site</li> <li>▪ Prompt revegetation of proposed landscaped areas</li> <li>▪ Perimeter sandbagging and silt fences and/or temporary basins to trap sediment</li> <li>▪ Regular sprinkling of exposed soils to control dust during construction</li> <li>▪ Installation of a minor retention basin(s) to alleviate discharge of increased flows</li> <li>▪ Specifications for construction waste handling and disposal</li> <li>▪ Erosion control measures maintained throughout the construction period</li> <li>▪ Construction of stabilized construction entrances to avoid trucks from imprinting debris on City roadways</li> <li>▪ Training of subcontractors on general site housekeeping</li> </ul> <p>The SWPPP is a "live" document and shall be kept current by the person responsible for its implementation.</p> <p><b>MM HYD-4.2</b> Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall submit a SUSMP that shall reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practical using BMPs, control techniques and systems, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions that are appropriate. The SUSMP shall include applicable post-construction measures,</p>	Less Than Significant

**Table ES-1** **Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
such as the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Control of impervious area runoff, including installation of detention basins, retention areas, filtering devices, energy dissipaters, pervious drainage systems, and porous pavement alternatives</li> <li>▪ Implementation of regular sweeping of impervious surfaces, such as streets and driveways;</li> <li>▪ Use of efficient irrigation practices</li> <li>▪ Provision of infiltration trenches and basins</li> <li>▪ Linings for urban runoff conveyance channels</li> <li>▪ Vegetated swales and strips</li> <li>▪ Protection of slopes and channels</li> <li>▪ Landscape design, such as xeriscape or other designs, minimizing the use of fertilizers</li> <li>▪ Minimization of stormwater runoff through site design</li> <li>▪ Construction of slough walls at toes of slopes for sediment control</li> <li>▪ Provision of covered trash enclosures</li> <li>▪ Provision of post-construction BMPs, such as approved stormwater filtration devices at the storm drain system in Monarch Drive and Haverstock Road</li> <li>▪ Provision of proof of obtaining annual maintenance for the proposed basins and BMPs by the developer</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact HYD-5</b> The proposed project has the potential for long-term adverse impacts to water quality from addition of pollutants typical of urban runoff. Additional automobile traffic generated from the proposed residential use of the site, as compared to the current undeveloped condition, could result in an increased incremental concentration of urban contaminants in stormwater runoff.	See MM HYD-2, MM HYD-4.1, and MM HYD-4.2, above.	Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other developments upstream and downstream of Subareas 1, 2, and 3. These cumulative projects will be various infill residential projects. Cumulative development within the City limits will generate similar hydrology and water quality impacts to those of the proposed project. Each of these projects will be subject to the same basic requirements and mitigation measures as the proposed project. Projects involving construction on sites that are one acre or greater in size will be required to implement a Stormwater

## Table ES-I Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and all hillside residences will be governed by the SUSMP adopted by City ordinance. Therefore, cumulative development within the City would not have a significant impact on hydrology and water quality.		
Regionally and watershed-wide, future development could result in additional impervious areas, which could reduce groundwater recharge opportunities. Most of the City of La Cañada Flintridge is underlain by the Raymond Basin, which contains a groundwater aquifer. However, the project site is located in the San Rafael Hills, which is not a primary component of the Raymond Basin. Some local recharge—approximately 24 acres as estimated by pad size and roadway infrastructure area—will be lost because of structures and paving. The Arroyo Seco watershed encompasses approximately 61 square miles, equivalent to approximately 2,657,160 acres. The loss of approximately 24 acres of recharge area on the project site represents only 0.0007 percent of the total Arroyo Seco watershed area and is not significant from a regional perspective. Opportunities for groundwater recharge will continue to occur throughout the area drained by the Arroyo Seco watershed.		

Locally, potential construction-related water quality and erosion effects are generally site-specific and would be controlled through implementation of State and local regulations, standards, and ordinances. Because the proposed project, as well as other development in the watershed, would comply with all relevant laws, regulations, and standards, neither the project's incremental contribution nor the cumulative effect of water quality impacts would be significant.

### LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section describes the existing land/use characteristics of the project site and the surrounding neighborhood, analyzes the potential conflicts of the proposed project with applicable land use plans and policies, and identifies potentially significant land use changes resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

<b>Impact LU-I</b>	The proposed project would not be consistent with General Plan Policies 3.I of the Land Use Element; 4.I and 4.2 of the Environmental Resource Management Element; 4.I of the Community Design Element; and Policies B, C, and H of the City's Hillside Ordinance. As no mitigation measures could reduce these inconsistencies, impacts associated with them would be significant and unavoidable.	None Available	Significant and Unavoidable
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>			

The cumulative context for the proposed project is provided in Table 1-1 (Cumulative Projects), and generally consists of single-home and appurtenant structure developments, with some City-wide capital improvement projects. Two larger developments—Annandale Canyon Estates and Artisan Square—are proposed in neighboring cities and would be irrelevant with respect to consistency with applicable plans and regulations of the City of La Cañada Flintridge. Consequently, these projects would not be considered as part of this cumulative analysis.

Other projects within the City would generally be consistent with General Plan policy and zoning requirements: where potential inconsistencies exist,

## Table ES-I Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
many of these projects include requests for variances, as allowed by the City zoning code, to bring them into compliance. Consequently, none of the projects were determined to result in significant land use impacts, and these projects would not significantly contribute to a cumulative land use impact within the City.		

In contrast, as described in Impact LU-I, the proposed project would have a significant unavoidable impact with respect to land use policy consistency, as a result of inconsistency with several policies in the Land Use, Environmental Resources Management, and Community Design Elements of the City's General Plan, as well as policies of the City's Hillside Ordinance. The policies with which the project is inconsistent were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or reducing significant environmental effects of development under the General Plan; consequently, inconsistency with these plans result in significant environmental effects that are described in the appropriate environmental issue area sections. The proposed project is the only pending project with significant land use effects even after consideration of variances and other sources of flexibility within City development regulations, and the property is the last large tract for which development is foreseeable. As a result, the entirety of the significant land use impacts within the City—and the significant impacts to resources of Citywide importance that result in part or in whole from these inconsistencies—would occur as a result of the proposed project and would, therefore, be cumulatively considerable.

### Noise

This section evaluates the potential noise impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project. This includes the potential for the project to cause a substantial temporary and/or permanent increase in ambient noise levels within or around the project site, or to expose people to excessive noise levels. All impacts with regard to noise from construction and operation of the proposed project were determined to be less than significant, specifically with regard to site preparation and construction activities, on-site noise levels, and off-site roadway noise levels.

### Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to the proposed project and other projects within the study area. Cumulative traffic-generated noise impacts have been assessed based on the difference between the existing traffic volumes and the future traffic volumes with the project, both with and without the proposed new residential development. Table 3.9-5 identifies the cumulative increase in noise level with the proposed project development. As shown, the increase in noise levels along the roadway segments within the vicinity of the proposed project would increase by a maximum of 0.4 dBA CNEL. Because this maximum increase would be less than 3 dBA CNEL, the change in future noise levels would not be cumulatively considerable.

### PUBLIC SERVICES

Public services include schools, libraries, hospitals, fire protection, and police protection. This section analyzes the impacts of the proposed project on public services. Impacts associated with police protection, schools, and public facilities, were determined in the Initial Study to be less than significant, and will be further analyzed in the EIR. Potentially significant impacts were identified with respect to fire protection services, specifically the potential for inadequate fire flows necessary for fire fighting activities.

**Impact PS-I** The proposed project could result in inadequate water pressure and supply for fire fighting services. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

MM PS-I	The Applicant shall develop and implement a system sufficient to provide water pressure, meeting the performance standards established by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, for	Less Than Significant
---------	---	-----------------------

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>Impact PS-1</b> Development in the project area would increase the number of students at nearby schools, exceeding capacity of elementary students in the school district. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	proposed Lots 10, 11, 12, and 13. Implementation shall occur prior to issuance of occupancy permits.  <b>MM PS-1.2</b> The proposed development must comply with all applicable codes and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and hydrants.	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact PS-2</b> Development in the project area would increase the number of students at nearby schools, exceeding capacity of elementary students in the school district. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	<b>MM PS-2</b> Consistent with current requirements, individual development projects shall pay statutory school fees in effect at the time of issuance of building permits to the La Cañada Flintridge School District for school facilities.	

**Cumulative Impacts**

Since the service demands anticipated to accompany the cumulative project population increase (within the City of La Cañada Flintridge) could be absorbed by the existing systems, the proposed project would not by itself create either an immediate or a short-term cumulative impact on fire protection/emergency response, law enforcement, or public school services.

The eventual development and occupation of the proposed project will cumulatively increase the risk of damage to property and/or life as a result of development in a wildland fire hazard area. This is considered to be a potentially significant impact. However, specific project-related impacts relative to fire hazards are considered to be less than significant with mitigation. The project site, as it exists, is in an area of wildland fires, and there would be no contribution to the cumulative risks of wildfire in the region. In addition, the County of Los Angeles Fire Department states that it is not aware of any other planned development in the area that may contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. However, the County of Los Angeles Fire Department anticipates that this project, in combination with the continued growth of La Cañada Flintridge and the surrounding region as a whole, would eventually result in need for additional personnel, equipment, and facilities, in order to accommodate both day-to-day service demands and large-scale emergencies such as earthquakes.

The Cumulative Project List, as illustrated in Chapter 1.0 of this EIR, identifies a total of 30 single-family housing units either approved, pending, under construction, or foreseeable. The most recent (2002) persons-per-household ratio within the City is 3.025. This factor applied to the total number of cumulative housing projects results in an estimated population increase of 91 persons. This population increase creates additional demand for public services including police enforcement services; however, the project's contribution to cumulative demands would be minor in comparison to regional development due to the small amount of additional need for public services associated with the proposed project. The projected cumulative project population increase of 91 persons would not cause the personnel-to-population ratio to drop from the approximately 2.3 on-duty deputies per 20,000 La Cañada Flintridge residents. This ratio is considered acceptable by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Therefore, additional demands from the proposed cumulative residential developments would not be substantial and would not be anticipated to overburden the existing police forces. Therefore, the cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the City would be less than significant.

Additional population would further contribute to elementary school capacity issues in the city. The projected cumulative project population increase of 91 persons would result in the generation of 24 school-age students (12 of which would be elementary level), using the parameters employed by the Los Angeles Unified School District. This is a conservative estimate that is based on the assumption that all the additional custom home units will be three or more bedroom single-family homes with above moderate incomes. However, projects that include additional residential units would be required to pay

## Table ES-1 Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
statutory school fees to address impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts would also be less than significant.		
<b>RECREATION</b>		
This section identifies and evaluates recreational resources that would potentially be affected by implementation of the proposed project and assesses potential impacts of the project on the identified recreational facilities and areas. No potentially significant impacts were identified with respect to recreational resources.		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
In addition to immediate, project-related impacts, the proposed project, in combination with other development in the City, would contribute to a cumulative increase in the demand for recreational facilities. This cumulative impact would be considered potentially significant. However, the project proposes the conservation of any existing trail system within the undeveloped parcel at its current state. This would retain current public recreation opportunities, pedestrian linkages between planning areas and open space resources, and natural views of scenic landforms, which would result in a beneficial impact on recreation throughout the City by providing new opportunities at the project site and throughout the adjacent area. As such, cumulative impacts resulting from the project would be less than significant.		
<b>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>		
The analysis in this section is based on the traffic study that was prepared for the proposed project by LSA Associates, Inc. and reviewed by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. Based on the traffic analysis, potentially significant impacts to project access and internal circulation, as well as construction access and traffic, were identified.		
<b>Impact TRAF-1</b> Development of the proposed project would result in increased construction traffic to and from the project site. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	<b>MM TRAF-1</b> A construction mitigation plan shall be developed and approved by the City, which shall include locations for on- and off-site parking for construction workers, designated hours of construction, as well as designated haul routes.	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact TRAF-2</b> Development of the proposed project could result in a dangerous condition for motorists and pedestrians due to impairment of sight distance at the intersections of (1) Chevy Chase Drive and Figueroa Street, (2) Inverness Drive and Corona Drive, and (3) Inverness Drive and Saint Katherine Drive. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	<b>MM TRAF-2</b> At the future intersection of Monarch Drive and Saint Katherine Drive the following improvements shall be implemented in order to provide added safety in the area: ▪ Installation of a stop sign on the (new) Monarch Drive approach with Saint Katherine Drive ▪ Reduced speed limit signs (15 mph) on Saint Katherine Drive approaches to the intersection ▪ Removal or trimming of vegetation not on private right-of-way which could improve sight distance at this location ▪ Providing visual aid (e.g., installing mirrors) for traffic turning onto Saint Katherine Drive from Monarch Drive and at the existing intersection of Palmerstone Drive and Saint Katherine Drive	Less Than Significant

**Table ES-1****Summary of Significant Impacts**

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<b>Impact TRAF-3</b> Some streets within and surrounding the proposed project area may not meet current minimum standards for safe and proper ingress/egress of traffic and/or emergency response vehicles. This is considered a potentially significant impact.	<b>MM TRAF-3.1</b> The proposed development will require proper ingress/egress access for the circulation of traffic and emergency response issues, which shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review prior to implementation.  <b>MM TRAF-3.2</b> Every building constructed shall be accessible to Fire Department apparatus by way of access roadways with an all weather surface of not less than the prescribed width, unobstructed, clear-to-sky.  <b>MM TRAF 3.3</b> The roadway shall be extended to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls when measured by an unobstructed route around the exterior of the building.	Less Than Significant

**Cumulative Impacts**

The future conditions with the project were assessed to determine the potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. As shown on Table 3.12-5, good levels of service are projected for the analyzed intersections, with a minimum increase in delay or ICU caused by the project. Also, Table 3.12-3 shows the expected daily traffic along the analyzed street segments. Similar to conditions for Existing Plus Project, the analyzed street segments fall within the third and fourth growth brackets. However, due to the fact that these street segments are not near capacity, the additional traffic associated with the project would be accommodated and overall cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING**

This section identifies and evaluates potential impacts of the project on population and housing within the area. No potentially significant impacts were identified.

**Cumulative Impacts**

As seen in Table 3.13-2, the most recent persons per household ratio within the City is 3.025 (2002). This factor, applied to the total number of cumulative housing projects in the City of La Cañada Flintridge (total of 28 residential units, including the proposed project's 17 residential units), results in an estimated population increase of 91. As discussed in the impact discussion, associated buildup of the residential units is estimated to increase the population of the City by 51 persons (based on the most recent 2002 estimated rate of 3.025 persons per household). As seen in Table 3.13-1, the most recent population of La Cañada Flintridge is 20,946. Table 3.13-8 indicates that SCAG projections are currently higher than the actual and projected population of La Cañada Flintridge. Therefore, the effect of the housing and residential lot developments contained within the cumulative project list would be considered less than significant. The effect of the La Cañada Flintridge Tentative Tract 53647 Development Project alone is not considered significant, even though it accounts for 56 percent of the total cumulative projected population increase, because the project area is considered one of the last developable parcels within the City. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to contribute significantly to the cumulative impact on population in the project area.

## Table ES-1 Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>		
This section evaluates the effects on utilities and service systems related to implementation of the proposed project by identifying anticipated demand and existing and planned utility availability		
<b>Impact UTIL-1</b> The proposed project would require final map and Variance 02-10 approval, construction of water supply, sewer and septic system, and electricity infrastructure, and the issuance of a building permit. The construction the infrastructure could have an adverse effect on the environment. This is considered a <i>potentially significant</i> impact.	With the exception of impacts associated with septic systems, all potentially significant impacts with respect to construction and extension of water, natural gas, and electrical infrastructure would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the appropriate construction mitigation measures as outlined in other sections of this EIR (e.g., Biological Resources and Geology and Soils).	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact UTIL-2</b> There is a potential for insufficient wastewater conveyance capacity in the Linda Vista sewer trunk line to which the proposed project's sewer infrastructure would connect downstream. Improvements to sewer infrastructure could be required that could result in adverse environmental impacts. This is considered a <i>potentially significant</i> impact.	<b>MM UTIL-1</b> Prior to final map approval, the Applicant shall agree to pay development fees and enter into a third-party agreement with the City of Pasadena and the County Sanitation Districts to provide any infrastructure improvements requested by the City of Pasadena in exchange for a will-serve agreement to connect to the Linda Vista/Arroyo Boulevard Sewer Trunk.	Less Than Significant
<b>Impact UTIL-3:</b> Due to the types of soils existing on the site, severe limitations for utilization of septic systems exist on portions of the site. Currently the feasibility of septic systems within lots 9-13 of the site has not been sufficiently demonstrated. This is a <i>potentially significant</i> impact.	None Available, but <b>MM UTIL-2</b> would lessen impacts.	Significant and Unavoidable
	<b>MM UTIL-2</b> Prior to final map approval, the Applicant must obtain all necessary permits to allow septic systems to be installed on lots 9 – 13. This would require the Applicant to demonstrate the feasibility of the septic systems to the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services, and other pertinent regulatory agencies by having a qualified and certified professional perform percolation tests and prepare soil profile reports for the areas to be served by the septic systems.	

**Cumulative Impacts:** Infrastructure capacity for utilities and other public services is a regional issue, due to recent and projected population increases in the Southern California area. Implementation of the proposed project could temporarily impact utilities and service systems due to the construction, renovation, or relocation of storm drains, sewage systems, water transport systems, and overhead power and communication lines. However, because construction and renovation activities would be temporary in nature, these impacts would not have a long-term effect.

**Wastewater.** Cumulative development would result in increased demands on wastewater treatment. However, the project's contribution to cumulative demands would be minor in comparison to regional development. Projected project wastewater generation represents less than 0.0001 percent of the remaining wastewater treatment capacity of the treatment facilities that would serve the project. Therefore, as the Whittier Narrows and Los Coyotes

## Table ES-I Summary of Significant Impacts

(for Significant Unavoidable Impacts, decision makers must issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved)

Impact Description	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
<b>WRPs retain excess capacity.</b> The individual contribution of the proposed project to wastewater treatment on a regional basis would also be less than significant. The City anticipates that wastewater treatment facility capacities are adequate to meet projected demands, and the proposed project would not incrementally contribute to an immediate or foreseeable cumulative impact to either of these services. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the proposed project on wastewater treatment is less than significant. As no excess capacity currently exists in the Linda Vista trunk sewer, into which the proposed project would deposit wastewater, the project's contribution to wastewater conveyance on a cumulative basis could be potentially significant. However, with infrastructure improvements that may be required as part of the conditions of a will-serve commitment from the City of Pasadena for the project, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level, and the project's contribution to cumulative wastewater impacts would also be less than significant.		
<b>Water.</b> The MWD, in its February 2002 Report on Metropolitan's Water Supplies, states that its existing supply capabilities can meet 100 percent of its member agencies' projected supplemental demands over the next 20 years in wet and average years, and 100 percent over the next 20 years in multiple dry years. With the supplies under development and a projected supply capability of 2,557,300 acre-feet per year (833.3 billion gallons), MWD can meet projected demands beyond the next 20 years (through 2030) even under a repeat of the worst drought conditions. MWD's analysis determined that current practices allow MWD to bring water supplies on line at least ten years in advance of demand; if all imported water supply programs and proposed local projects proceed as planned, with no change in demand projections, water supply reliability could be assured beyond 20 years. The proposed project would not contribute to additional water demands beyond growth projections. The City anticipates that water supply is adequate to meet projected demands. No immediate or foreseeable cumulative impacts to water supply are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. No cumulative impacts to water supply providers are anticipated in the short or long term. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.		

**Solid Waste.** The estimated solid waste generation associated with cumulative development would result in an overall increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the City. The service provider has indicated that current landfill capacity is adequate to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs. According to the Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, 2000 Report, projected remaining permitted capacity in area landfills is 151.43 million tons per year (Class III and unclassified landfills, excluding waste-to-energy facilities). The City currently has an ordinance (Chapter 9.14 on the Municipal Code, Recycling and Diversion of Construction and Demolition Debris), which requires the diversion of at least 50 percent of the total construction and demolition debris generated by a project via reuse or recycling. In addition, the City has received an extension through December 2003 to achieve a 50 percent total diversion rate, and is currently in compliance with AB 939. The individual contribution of the proposed project to solid waste generation on a regional basis would be less than significant on a project level. Even with the rate of development in Los Angeles County and the southern California region, the landfills servicing the project area have sufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste generated by the proposed project in addition to their present and reasonably foreseeable commitments through 2020, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively significant contribution to decrease in landfill capacity, and cumulative impacts to solid waste and solid waste disposal services would be less than significant.

---

# I.0 INTRODUCTION

---

## I.1 PURPOSE AND LEGAL AUTHORITY

The proposed project requires the discretionary approval of the Planning Commission of the City of La Cañada Flintridge. Therefore, it is subject to the requirements of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In accordance with Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of this EIR is to serve as an informational document that:

...will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

The EIR has been prepared as a Project EIR pursuant to Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines. A Project EIR is appropriate for a specific development project. As stated in the CEQA Guidelines:

...this type of EIR should focus on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project, including planning, construction and operation.

This report is to serve as an informational document for the public and the City of La Cañada Flintridge decision-makers. The process will culminate with Planning Commission hearings (and the City Council if appealed by any party) to consider certification of a Final EIR (FEIR) and a decision on whether or not to approve the proposed project.

## I.2 SCOPE OF THE EIR

As described in Section 15143 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines:

The EIR shall focus on the significant effects on the environment. The significant effects should be discussed with emphasis in proportion to their severity and probability of occurrence. Effects dismissed in an Initial Study as clearly insignificant and unlikely to occur need not be discussed further in the EIR unless the Lead Agency subsequently receives information inconsistent with the finding in the Initial Study.

This EIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The scope of the EIR includes environmental issues determined to be potentially significant by the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP), responses to the IS/NOP, and scoping discussions among the public, consulting staff, and the City. The IS/NOP and comment letters received during the IS/NOP review period, are included in Appendices A and B of this EIR.

The IS/NOP and corresponding comment letters identified potentially significant impacts on the following issue areas associated with the construction and/or operation of the proposed project, which are addressed in detail in this EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources

- Geology and Soils
- Hazards
- Hydrology
- Land Use
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Circulation
- Population and Housing
- Utilities and Service Systems

In accordance with Section 15128 (Effects Not Found to Be Significant) of the CEQA Guidelines, the IS/NOP (Appendix A) provides reasons why certain environmental impacts were not considered significant and, therefore, are not addressed further in this EIR. These include the issue areas of agricultural resources, economic and social impacts, and mineral resources, and utilities and service systems.

This EIR addresses the issues referenced above and identifies potentially significant environmental impacts, including site-specific and cumulative effects of the project in accordance with the provisions set forth in the CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the EIR recommends feasible mitigation measures, where possible, that would reduce or eliminate adverse environmental effects.

In preparing the EIR, use was made of pertinent City policies and guidelines, existing EIRs and background documents prepared by the City, including the City's General Plan. A full reference list is contained in Section 7.0 (References) of this EIR.

The Alternatives Section of the EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15126(d) of the CEQA Guidelines. It also identifies the "environmentally superior" alternative among the alternatives assessed. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the CEQA-required "no project" alternative and three alternative development scenarios on site.

### **I.3 LEAD, RESPONSIBLE, AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES**

The CEQA Guidelines define lead, responsible, and trustee agencies. The City of La Cañada Flintridge is the lead agency for the project because it holds principal responsibility for approving the project.

A responsible agency refers to a public agency other than the lead agency that has discretionary approval over the project. For this project, the South Coast Regional Air Quality Management Board and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (NPDES permits) are responsible agencies. A trustee agency refers to a State agency having lawful jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project. For the proposed project, the California

Department of Fish & Game, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are trustee agencies.

## **I.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

This EIR has been prepared to meet all of the substantive and procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.); California CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq.); and the rules, regulations, and procedures for the implementation of CEQA as adopted by the City of La Cañada Flintridge. Accordingly, the City of La Cañada Flintridge has been identified as the Lead Agency for this project, taking primary responsibility for conducting the environmental review and approving or denying the project.

As a first step in complying with the procedural requirements of CEQA, the City prepared an Initial Study (IS) to determine whether any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may cause a significant effect on the environment and, if so, to narrow the focus (or scope) of the environmental analysis. For this project, the IS indicated that a Project EIR should focus on land use, population and housing, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, air quality, hazards, transportation/circulation, noise, public services, utilities and service systems, cultural resources, biological resources, and aesthetics.

After completion of the IS, the City filed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) with the California Office of Planning and Research as an indication that an EIR would be prepared. In turn, the IS/NOP was distributed to involved public agencies for a 30-day public review period, which began on July 2, 2002, and ended on August 5, 2002. The purpose of the public review period was to solicit comments on the scope and content of the environmental analysis to be included in the Draft EIR (DEIR). The City received nine comment letters on the IS/NOP, which are included in Appendix B of this EIR.

During preparation of the DEIR, agencies, organizations, and persons who the City believed might have an interest in this project were specifically contacted via a mailed notice and/or a newspaper advertisement announcing a public Scoping Meeting that was to be held on December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2002 at City Hall. Information, data, and observations from these contacts are included in the EIR. Agencies or interested persons who did not respond during the public review period of the IS/NOP will have an opportunity to comment during the public review period for the DEIR, as well as at subsequent hearings on the project.

This DEIR has been distributed to affected agencies, surrounding cities, counties, and interested parties for a 45-day review period in accordance with Section 15087 of the CEQA Guidelines. During the 45-day public review period, the DEIR was available for general public review at the following locations:

The City of La Cañada Flintridge  
City Hall  
1327 Foothill Boulevard,  
La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137  
Hours: 8 A.M.–5 P.M., Monday–Thursday  
8 A.M.–12 P.M., Friday

La Cañada Flintridge Public Library  
4545 N. Oakwood Avenue  
Hours: 9 A.M.–9 P.M., Monday–Thursday  
9 A.M.–6P.M., Friday & Saturday  
1 P.M.–5 P.M., Sunday

## **Executive Summary**

---

The review period for the Draft EIR is from Wednesday April 30th, 2003 through Friday June 6th, 2003. All comments on the Draft **EIR must be received by 5:00 p.m. on Monday June 16, 2003.**

Frederick Buss, Senior Planner  
City of La Cañada Flintridge  
Community Development Department  
1327 Foothill Boulevard  
La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137

Upon completion of the 45-day public review period, written responses to all significant comments raised with respect to environmental issues discussed in the DEIR will be prepared and incorporated into the FEIR. Furthermore, written responses to comments received from any State agencies will be made available to these agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing during which the certification of FEIR will be considered. These comments and their responses will be included in the FEIR for consideration by the City of La Cañada Flintridge Planning Commission and City Council, as well as any other public decision-makers.

According to PRC Section 21081, the Lead Agency must make specific Findings of Fact (Findings) before approving the FEIR, when the DEIR identifies significant environmental impacts that may result from a project. The purpose of the Findings is to establish the link between the contents of the FEIR and the action of the Lead Agency with regard to approval or rejection of the project. Prior to approval of a project, one of three findings must be made:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by the other agency or can and should be adopted by the other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR.

Additionally, according to PRC Section 21081.6, for projects in which significant impacts will be avoided by mitigation measures, the Lead Agency must include a mitigation monitoring program (MMP). The purpose of the MMP is to ensure compliance with required mitigation during implementation of the project.

However, environmental impacts may not always be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. When this occurs, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. If a public agency approves a project that has significant and unavoidable impacts, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project, based on the FEIR and any other information in the public record. This is termed a "statement of overriding considerations" and is used to explain the specific reasons why the benefits of a proposed project make its unavoidable environmental effects acceptable. The statement is prepared, if required, after the FEIR has been completed, yet before any action to approve the project has been taken.

## I.5 EIR ADEQUACY

The level of detail contained throughout this EIR is consistent with the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15151) and recent court decisions, which provide the standard of adequacy on which this document is based. The Guidelines state that:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information, which enables them to make a decision, which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

## I.6 INTENDED USE OF THE EIR

This EIR has been prepared to analyze potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the planning, construction, and operation of the proposed project and to address appropriate and feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives that would minimize or eliminate these impacts. This document is intended to serve as an informational document, as outlined in Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines:

An EIR is an informational document, which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information, which may be presented to the agency.

Furthermore, this EIR will provide the primary source of environmental information for consideration by the lead, responsible, and trustee agencies when exercising any permitting authority or approval power directly related to implementation of this project.

As previously mentioned, this EIR is intended to provide decision-makers and the public with information that enables them to intelligently consider the environmental consequences of the proposed action. This EIR identifies significant or potentially significant environmental effects, as well as ways in which those impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels, whether through the imposition of mitigation measures or through the implementation of specific alternatives to the project. In a practical sense, EIRs function as a technique for fact-finding, allowing an applicant, concerned citizens, and agency staff an opportunity to collectively review and evaluate baseline conditions and project impacts through a process of full disclosure.

To gain the most value from this report, certain key points recommended in the CEQA Guidelines should be kept in mind:

- This report should be used as a tool to give the reader an overview of the possible ramifications of the proposed project. It is designed to be an “early warning system” with regard to potential environmental impacts and subsequent effects on the local community’s environmental resources.
- A specific environmental impact is not necessarily irreversible or permanent. Most impacts, particularly in urban, more developed areas, can be wholly or partially mitigated by incorporating changes recommended in this report during the design and construction phases of project development.

- This report, while a summary of facts, reflects the professional judgment of the author. Therefore, the reader will have to individually weigh the facts that it reports.

## **I.7 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE**

According to Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines:

- (a) An EIR or negative declaration may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Where all or part of another document is incorporated by reference, the incorporated language shall be considered to be set forth in full as part of the text of the EIR or negative declaration.
- (b) Where part of another document is incorporated by reference, such other document shall be made available to the public for inspection at a public place or public building. The EIR or negative declaration shall state where the incorporated documents will be available for inspection. At a minimum, the incorporated documents shall be made available to the public in an office of the lead agency in the county where the project would be carried out or in one or more public buildings such as county offices or public libraries if the lead agency does not have an office in the county.
- (c) Where an EIR or negative declaration uses incorporation by reference, the incorporated part of the referenced document shall be briefly summarized where possible or briefly described if the data or information cannot be summarized. The relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and the EIR shall be described.

As such, the following document is hereby incorporated by reference:

- City of La Cañada Flintridge General Plan.

## **I.8 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION**

This EIR has been designed for easy use and reference. To help the reader locate information of particular interest, a brief summary of the contents of each section of the EIR is provided. The following chapters are contained within the EIR:

**Executive Summary**—This section contains a summary of the proposed project and its objectives, as well as an overview of the scope of the DEIR and description of areas of controversy. This section provides a summary of environmental impacts, proposed mitigation, level of significance after mitigation, and unavoidable impacts.

**Chapter 1**      **Introduction**—This section describes the purpose, intended use, and scope of the DEIR; a summary of the environmental and public review process; the project's proponents and relevant agencies; the availability of the DEIR; documents incorporated by reference; and a brief outline of this document's organization.

**Chapter 2**      **Project Description**—This section defines the project location, describes the characteristics of the project site, describes the site's history, outlines the Applicant's project objectives, summarizes the proposed project, describes project phasing, and identifies the approvals required by the City for the project implementation.

- 
- Chapter 3**      **Environmental Analysis**—This section describes and evaluates the environmental issue areas, including the existing environmental setting and background, applicable environmental thresholds, environmental impacts (both short term and long term), policy considerations related to the particular environmental issue area under analysis, mitigation measures capable of minimizing environmental harm, and a discussion of cumulative impacts. Where additional actions must be taken to ensure consistency with environmental policies, recommendations are made, as appropriate. By consolidating environmental impact assessment and site-specific policy directives within each impact area, clear linkages between impact assessment and related policy consistency can be established.
- Chapter 4**      **Alternatives to the Proposed Project**—This section analyzes feasible alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project Alternative, a reduction in project scale, and alternative uses for the proposed project.
- Chapter 5**      **Other CEQA Considerations**—This section provides a summary of the proposed project's potential to lead to population growth (and indirect implications of that growth on the City) and identifies the irreversible changes to the natural environment resulting from the proposed project. In addition, pursuant to Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines, this section briefly discusses those issue areas that were determined in the Initial Study for the project not to result in significant environmental impacts.
- Chapter 6**      **Organizations Consulted and List of EIR Preparers**—This section provides a list of the names of all persons and organizations consulted as well as all persons responsible for preparation of this DEIR.
- Chapter 7**      **References**—This section provides bibliographic references for all documents or persons consulted in preparation of the DEIR.

## I.9 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS SCENARIO

Cumulative impacts refer to the combined effect of project impacts with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Both CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that cumulative impacts be analyzed in an EIR when the resulting impacts are cumulatively considerable and, therefore, potentially significant. The discussion of cumulative impacts must reflect the severity of the impacts, as well as the likelihood of their occurrence; however, the discussion need not be as detailed as the discussion of environmental impacts attributable to the project alone. Furthermore, the discussion is intended to be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness. According to Section 15355 of the 2001 CEQA Guidelines:

“Cumulative impacts” refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

- (a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.
- (b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably

foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Furthermore, according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (a)(1):

As defined in Section 15355, a “cumulative impact” consists of an impact, which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts, which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.

In addition, as stated in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064(i)(5) it should be noted that:

- (5) The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable.

Therefore, the cumulative discussion in an EIR focuses on whether the impacts of the project under review are cumulatively considerable within the context of impacts caused by other past, present, or future projects. Table 1-1 provides a list of cumulative projects considered in this environmental analysis. This list is comprised of development projects planned, approved, or under construction in the City of La Cañada Flintridge. Cumulative impact discussions for each issue area are provided in the technical analyses contained within Section 3.0 (Environmental Analysis).

Each related project listed in Table 1-1 is described by name, location, square footage (if known) and status of the project. For an analysis of the cumulative impacts associated with these cumulative projects and the proposed project, the reader is referred to the cumulative impact discussions under each individual issue area analysis presented in Section 3.0 (Environmental Analysis) of this EIR.

Cumulative impacts analyzed in this EIR (impacts from related projects in conjunction with the proposed project) would likely represent a “worst-case” scenario for the following reasons:

- Not all of the related projects are expected to be approved and/or built. Further, it is also likely that many of the related projects will not be constructed or opened until after the proposed project had been built and occupied.
- Some related projects are now completed and occupied.
- Impact projections for related projects would likely be, or have been, subject to unspecified mitigation measures, which would reduce potential impacts.
- Many related projects are expressed in terms of gross square footage or are conceptual plans such as master plans that assume complete development; in reality, such projects may be smaller (i.e. the net new development) because of the demolition or removal of existing land uses resulting from development of the related project.

**Table I-1 Cumulative Projects**

<b>Address/Name</b>	<b>Applicant/Case Manager</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Inverness Dr/Palmherst City Wide	Kudrave Architects City	18 lots	Pending
4055 Chevy Chase Dr.	Jennings/Tyler	2002-2003 Capital Improvement Plan R	Approved
355 Corona Drive	Baroian	New 10,966 sf residential	Approved
4827 La Cañada Boulevard	Troedsson/Yunker	New 3,500 sf residence	Approved
4339 Oakwood Avenue	Gavina	Lot Split/ inadequate frontage	Approved
355 Flintridge Oaks Drive	George/Cimmarusti	Requests 5,968 sf	Approved
5024 Angeles Crest Highway	Nicholas/Stoddard	New 5,119 sf residence	Approved
1800 Foothill Boulevard	City	Divide 71,000 sf into 3 lots	Approved
Leir Drive	Younanian/Ott	Passive park	Approved
5187 Haskel Street	Gharibian/Marcoosi	New 4,540 sf residence	Pending
4075 Chevy Chase Drive	Sosa/Xandeveldie	New 7,267 sf residential/pool house	Pending
4827 La Cañada Boulevard	Troedsson	Remove/replace with 5,700 sf residence	Pending
5126 Greencrest Road	Johnson/Smith	4,500 sf residence	Pending
104 Berkshire Place	La Cañada United Methodist Church	New 774 sf Accessory Living Quarters	Approved
2211 Canalda Drive	Airtine	New 8,000 sf hall & 6,000 sf Sanctuary	Approved
4357 Commonwealth	Magill/Hutchins	Detached ALQ in R-1-15,000 zone	Approved
4063 Chevy Chase Drive	Najarian	699 sf ALQ/400 sf porch addition	Approved
Palmerstone	Jangoian/Najaria	1,013 sf removal and 3,010 sf removal	Approved
870 St. Katherine Drive	Barcus/Anderson	New 7,015 sf residence	Approved
1874 Palm Terrace	Palm Drive L.L.C.	New 6,200 sf residence	Approved
Via Serrano	Anderson	New 5,190 sf residence	Approved
Weirfield Drive off Glen Oaks / Annandale Canyon	John Head	5 New residences	Approved, in construction
Altadena and Villa / Artisan Square	Province Group	Develop existing subdivisions with 24 single-family homes	Pending
		Status: Plan Development Application Submitted	
		52-unit Condominium Development	Pending
		Status: Predevelopment Plan Review	